COLO-HEP-284
hepth@xxx/9206020
June, 1992

Black Hole Physics from Liouville Theory

arXiv:hep-th/9206020v2 12 Jun 1992

S.P. de Alwis*

Dept. of Physics, Box 390,
University of Colorado,
Boulder, CO 80309

ABSTRACT

In a previous paper it was shown that the quantum consistency conditions for the dilaton-gravity theory of Callan et al., imply that the cosmological constant term undergoes a dilaton dependent renormalization, in such a manner that the theory can be written as a Liouville-like theory. In this paper we discuss the physical interpretation of the solutions of this theory. In particular we demonstrate explicitly how quantum corrections tame the black hole singularity. Also under the assumption that in asymptotically Minkowski coordinates, there are no incoming or outgoing ghosts, we show that the Hawking radiation rate is independent of the number of matter fields and is determined by the ghost conformal anomaly.

* dealwis@gopika.colorado.edu

In reference [1] a theory of dilaton gravity which had black hole solutions resulting from a collapsing matter shock wave was presented by Callan, Giddings, Harvey, and Strominger [CGHS]. By adding the conformal anomaly term to this classical action these authors were able to discuss Hawking radiation [2] from this black hole. However in the weak coupling approximation ($e^{2\phi} << 1$ where ϕ is the dilaton) in which these authors worked it was not possible to discuss many interesting questions. For instance it was argued in [1] that (when N the number of matter fields is very large, so that semi-classical arguments are applicable) the black hole radiates away all its energy leaving a zero mass residue behind. However it was pointed out [3, 4] that this theory has a singularity which prevents the passage from the linear dilaton region (where $e^{-2\phi} > N >> 1$) to the Liouville region (where $N > e^{-2\phi} >> 1$). Since the smooth transition between these two regions was a necessary condition for the argument of [1], it was clear that the latter was not valid. Subsequently it was realized [5, 6, 7] that this singularity is absent when $N < 24$. However in that case semi-classical methods were no longer applicable. One needed the exact solution of the field equations corrected by the quantum anomaly terms.

In the previous paper by the author [6], and in a paper by Bilal and Callan [7], this problem was solved by showing that the quantum consistency conditions on the CGHS theory require that it be of the Liouville type. This happens because the (dilaton dependent) cosmological constant undergoes a (dilaton dependent) renormalization. As mentioned in [6] and discussed in detail [7] the new (classical) field equations are solvable. The new field space coordinates are explicit (though non-trivial) functions of the conformal metric factor and the dilaton, and these solutions therefore are valid to all orders in the dilatonic coupling $e^{2\phi}$. Of course these are not the full quantum equations since the effects of dilaton and graviton loops are not included.† Nevertheless it is sufficient for our purposes in that we can

† Actually since the consistent quantum theory is of the Liouville type it is possible that all quantum effects in this theory can be discussed. However this is a subject for future discussion.

discuss the effects of Hawking radiation and back reaction without assuming weak coupling (i.e. being inconsistent).

Let us first summarize the results of [6]. The classical CGHS action[‡] is

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d^2\sigma\sqrt{-g}[e^{-2\phi}(R + 4(\nabla\phi)^2 + 4\lambda^2) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\nabla f^i)^2]. \tag{1}$$

The corresponding quantum field theory is defined by

$$Z = \int \frac{[dg]_g[d\phi]_g[df]_g}{[Vol.\ Diff.]} e^{iS[g,\phi,f]}. \tag{2}$$

By generalizing an argument first given in [8],[§] this theory can be written in the gauge fixed form (in the conformal gauge $g = e^{2\rho}\hat{g}$)

$$Z = \int [dX^\mu]_{\hat{g}}[df]_{\hat{g}}([db][dc])_{\hat{g}} e^{iI(X,\hat{g})+iS(f,\hat{g})+iS(b,c,\hat{g})}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$I[X,\hat{g}] = -\frac{1}{4\pi}\int \sqrt{-\hat{g}}[\frac{1}{2}\hat{g}^{ab}G_{\mu\nu}\partial_a X^\mu \partial_b X^\nu + \hat{R}\Phi(X) + T(X)]. \tag{4}$$

Note that all the measures in (3) are defined with respect to the $2d$ metric $\hat{g}$. Since the original theory is independent of the fiducial metric $\hat{g}$ the gauge fixed theory must satisfy the constraints

$$< T_{\pm\pm} + t_{\pm\pm} >= 0, \tag{5}$$

and

$$< T_{+-} + t_{+-} >= 0, \tag{6}$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the stress tensor for the dilaton-gravity and matter sectors, and $t_{\mu\nu}$

‡ $-\lambda^2$ should be replaced by λ^2 in equations (1) and (10) of reference [5].

§ This generalization has been considered before by several authors [9].

is the stress tensor for the ghost sector. In addition one must have the integrability condition for these constraints, namely the Virasoro algebra with zero central charge. This means that G, Φ and T must obey certain beta-function equations. By solving these equations under the boundary conditions that the theory reduces to the CGHS theory in the weak coupling limit, it was shown that the theory is of the form, (choosing $\hat{g}$ to be the Minkowski metric $\hat{g}_{+-} = -\frac{1}{2},\ \hat{g}_{\pm\pm} = 0$)

$$Z = \int [dX][dY][df][db][dc] e^{iS[X,Y,f] + iS_{ghost}},$$

where,

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^2\sigma [-\partial_+ X \partial_- X + \partial_+ Y \partial_- Y + \sum_i \partial_+ f^i \partial_- f^i + 2\lambda^2 e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(X-Y)}]. \quad (7)$$

In the above $\kappa = \frac{24-N}{6}$, and the signs are appropriate for the case where $\kappa > 0$.¶ The new fields X and Y are defined in terms of the conformal factor and the dilaton by the following equations.

$$\begin{aligned} X =& 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}} \int e^{-2\phi} (1 + \kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ =& 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}} [-\frac{1}{2} e^{-2\phi} (1 + \kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\kappa}{4} \log 2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\phi + \\ & + \log(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2} e^{2\phi} + (1 + \kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ \simeq & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}} e^{-2\phi} + \sqrt{2\kappa}\phi + const. + O(\kappa e^{2\phi}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

(the last relation is valid only in the weak coupling limit $e^{-2\phi} >> 1$)

$$Y = \sqrt{2\kappa}(\rho - \kappa^{-1} e^{-2\phi}). \quad (9)$$

¶ There should be an overall minus sign in front of the integral sign and T should be multiplied by a factor $-\frac{1}{2}$ in equation (27) of [6].

The equations of motion coming from (7) are

$$\partial_+\partial_- f = 0, \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_+\partial_- X =& \lambda^2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}(X-Y)}\\ \partial_+\partial_- Y =& \lambda^2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}(X-Y)}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Equation (10) gives

$$f = f_+(\sigma^+) + f_-(\sigma^-).$$

Subtracting the second from the first in (11) we have, $\partial_+\partial_-(X-Y) = 0$, giving

$$X = Y + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}(g_+(\sigma^+) + g_-(\sigma^-)).$$

Substituting this result into (say) the Y equation we get,

$$\partial_+\partial_- Y = \lambda^2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}e^{-(g_+(\sigma^+)+g_-(\sigma^-))}.$$

This may be trivially integrated giving the solution,

$$\begin{aligned}Y =& -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(u_+(\sigma^+) + u_-(\sigma^-)) + \lambda^2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\int^{\sigma^+} d\sigma^+ e^{-g_+(\sigma^+)}\int^{\sigma^-} d\sigma^- e^{-g_-(\sigma^-)}\\ =& X - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}(g_+ + g_-).\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

In the above $g_\pm, u_\pm$ are arbitrary (chiral) functions of $\sigma^\pm$. $g_\pm$ may be set to zero by a conformal transformation and $u_\pm$ have to be determined by the boundary conditions.

These solutions are of exactly the same form as the CGHS solutions to the classical theory without conformal anomalies. Our observation amounts to the statement that all the complications due to the latter are hidden in the relations (11) between the fields X, Y and the original fields ϕ, ρ.* With this choice we have

$$X = Y = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(u - \lambda^2\sigma^+\sigma^-). \tag{13}$$

where $u = u_+ + u_-$. In the semi-classical limit ($e^{-2\phi} >> 1$) using the relations (8), and (9), we have from the above solution (in this limit $X = Y$ implies $\phi = \rho$),

$$e^{-2\phi} = e^{-2\rho} = u - \lambda^2\sigma^+\sigma^-, \tag{14}$$

which is just the CGHS solution.

The classical metric and curvature are singular on the curve defined by the vanishing of the left hand side of (14). However this singularity is in the strong coupling limit $e^{\phi} >> 1$, where we have from (8),

$$\begin{aligned} X =& 2\sqrt{2}\int e^{-\phi}\left(1 + \frac{e^{-2\phi}}{\kappa}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ =& 2\sqrt{2}\left(-e^{-\phi} - \frac{e^{-3\phi}}{6\kappa} + O(\frac{e^{-5\phi}}{\kappa})\right). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Using our solution (13) and (9) we then get,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\phi} \simeq& \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\kappa}}(u - \lambda^2\sigma^+\sigma^-), \\ \rho \simeq& -\frac{1}{\kappa}(u - \lambda^2\sigma^+\sigma^-). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Thus the quantum corrected metric $e^{2\rho}$ is not singular at the strong coupling point. The quantum effects have eliminated the classical black hole singularity. Let us now

* The coordinate choice for which $g_{\pm}$ is zero is the Kruskal-Szekeres type one denoted by $x^{\pm}$ in [1]. We will however continue to call these coordinates $\sigma^{\pm}$.

work out some of the consequences of our exact solution. By taking the derivative of (13) with respect to $\sigma^{\pm}$ and using (8), and (9), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 2e^{-2\phi}(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_{\pm}\phi =& -\partial_{\pm}u\pm + \lambda^2\sigma^{\mp} \\ =& \kappa\partial_{\pm}\rho + 2e^{-2\phi}\partial_{\pm}\phi, \end{aligned}$$

giving us

$$2e^{-2\phi}\partial_{\pm}\phi = -\frac{(\partial_{\pm}u_{\pm} - \lambda^2\sigma^{\pm})}{(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{17}$$

$$\kappa\partial_{\pm}\rho = -\frac{(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1}{(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}}}(\partial_{\pm}u_{\pm} - \lambda^2\sigma^{\mp}). \tag{18}$$

The first equation gives us the trajectory of the apparent horizon ($\partial_+\phi = 0$) of the putative black hole, introduced by Russo, Susskind and Thorlacius [3]; i.e.

$$\sigma^- = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\partial_+ u_+(\sigma^+). \tag{19}$$

We can also calculate the curvature.

$$\begin{aligned} R = 8e^{-2\rho}\partial_+\partial_-\rho = & -\frac{8\lambda^2(1-(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}})}{\kappa(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^{\frac{1}{2}}}e^{-2\rho} \\ & +4e^{4\phi-2\rho}\frac{(\partial_- u_- - \lambda^2\sigma^+)(\partial_+ u_+ - \lambda^2\sigma^-)}{(1+\kappa e^{2\phi})^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $e^{2\phi}$ and $e^{-2\rho}$ are determined implicitly by (8), (9), and (13). This expression shows clearly how the curvature singularity of the classical theory (i.e. the strong coupling singularity at $e^{2\phi} \to \infty$), is tamed by the quantum anomaly corrections; specifically by the $O(\kappa e^{2\phi})$ terms in the denominators. Of course for $\kappa < 0$ we would have the singularity discovered in [3, 4].

In order to determine the function u we need to use the constraints (5). ((6) is not a new equation since it is equivalent to the ρ equation of motion). Calculating the stress tensor for the non-ghost part of the action from (7) we get,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\pm\pm} =& -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\pm X\partial_\pm X - \partial_\pm Y\partial_\pm Y) - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\partial_\pm^2 Y + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i\partial_\pm f^i \\ =& e^{-2\phi}(4\partial_\pm\phi\partial_\pm\rho - 2\partial_\pm^2\phi) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i\partial_\pm f^i + \kappa(\partial_\pm\rho\partial_\pm\rho - \partial_\pm^2\rho). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In the coordinate system that we have chosen $X = Y$, so that substituting the solution (13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\pm\pm} =& \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i\partial_\pm f^i - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\partial_\pm Y \\ =& \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i\partial_\pm f^i + \partial_\pm^2 u_\pm. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the constraint equations (5) become,

$$\partial_\pm^2 u_\pm + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i\partial_\pm f^i + t_{\pm\pm} = 0.$$

Following [1] we assume that matter falls in in the form of a shock wave with $\frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_+ f^i\partial_+ f^i = a\delta(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+),\ f_- = 0$. Solving the above equations we then have,

$$\begin{aligned} u_+ =& a_+ + b_+\sigma^+ - a(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+)\theta(\sigma^+ - \sigma_-^+) - \int\int t_{++}(\sigma^+), \\ u_- =& a_- + b_-\sigma^- - \int\int t_{--}(\sigma^-). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Now under a conformal transformation $\sigma^\pm \to \hat{\sigma}^\pm = f^\pm(\sigma^\pm)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
T'_{\pm\pm}(\hat{\sigma}) &= \left(\frac{\partial f^{\pm}}{\partial \sigma^{\pm}}\right)^{-2}[T_{\pm\pm}(\sigma) - \frac{\kappa + N + 2}{2} Df^{\pm}], \\
t'_{\pm\pm}(\hat{\sigma}) &= \left(\frac{\partial f^{\pm}}{\partial \sigma^{\pm}}\right)^{-2}[t_{\pm\pm}(\sigma) - \frac{-26}{12} Df^{\pm}],
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

where Df is the Schwartz derivative defined by,

$$
Df = \frac{f'''}{f'} - \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{f''}{f'}\right)^2.
$$

The sum of the two stress tensors is zero in every frame but one cannot put one or the other to zero except in a particular frame. We will argue that the ghost stress tensor should be put to zero in the asymptotically Minkowski frame which covers all of space-time.[⋆] Such a frame is defined by the transformation (for $\sigma^+ > \sigma_0^+$)

$$
\hat{\sigma}^+ = \frac{1}{\lambda}\log(\lambda\sigma^+),\ \hat{\sigma}^- = -\frac{1}{\lambda}\log(-\lambda\sigma^-).
$$

Calculating the Schwartz derivative for this we find $Df^+ = \frac{1}{2\sigma^{+2}},\ Df^- = \frac{1}{2\sigma^{-2}}$. Plugging this into (23) and putting $t'(\hat{\sigma}) = 0$ we get,

$$
t_{++} = -\frac{26}{24}\frac{1}{\sigma^{+2}},\ t_{--} = -\frac{26}{24}\frac{1}{\sigma^{-2}}.
$$

Substituting these values into (22) we find,

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_+ =& a_+ + b_+\sigma + -a(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+)\theta(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+) - \frac{26}{24}\log\sigma^+, \\
u_- =& a_- + b_-\sigma^- - \frac{26}{24}\log(\sigma^-).
\end{aligned}
\tag{24}
$$

To get the classical solution of [1] with infalling matter we should put $a_\pm = 0 = b_\pm$.

⋆ This argument was first made in 7. However the result for Hawking radiation in that paper is somewhat different from ours.

Then we can find the trajectory of the apparent horizon from (19).

$$\sigma_H^- = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(-a\theta(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+) - \frac{26}{24}\frac{1}{\sigma}). \tag{25}$$

For the rate of recession of the horizon we have (note that σ^- ranges from 0 to $-\infty$)

$$\frac{d\sigma_H^-}{d\sigma^+} = -\frac{a}{\lambda^2}\delta(\sigma^+ - \sigma_0^+) + \frac{26}{24}\frac{1}{\lambda^2\sigma^{+2}}. \tag{26}$$

The first term is the contribution of the infalling ($a > 0$) matter which tends to make the horizon move forward and the second (positive defintite) term is that due to Hawking radiation and causes the horizon to recede. This equation should be compared with equation (21) of [3]. It should be noted that the factor N in the latter is replaced by 26 and $\frac{1}{\sigma_0^{+2}}$ by $\frac{1}{\sigma^{+2}}$. (The in fall term is not written out in [3]).

Again following [3] we may define the mass of the black hole as $M(\sigma^+) = \lambda e^{-2\phi}|_H$, where the right hand side is to be evaluated at the apparent horizon. For the classical solution this expression gives the ADM mass of the black hole. Using $\partial_-(e^{-2\phi}) = -\lambda^2\sigma^+$ for large light cone times, we have $\frac{dM}{d\sigma^+} = -\lambda^3\sigma^+\frac{d\sigma_H^-}{d\sigma^+} = -\lambda\frac{26}{24}\frac{1}{\sigma^+}$. Or transforming to our asymptotically Minkowski coordinate $\hat{\sigma}^+$,

$$\frac{dM}{d\hat{\sigma}^+} = -\lambda^2\frac{26}{24}. \tag{27}$$

The rate of Hawking radiation can also be calculated directly by transforming from the asymptotically Minkowski coordinate $\hat{\sigma}^-$ to the asymptotically Minkowski coordinate $\overline{\sigma} = -\frac{1}{\lambda}\log(e^{-\lambda\hat{\sigma}_-} - \frac{a}{\lambda})$ in which the classical solution is static. This coordinate covers only the region outside the horizon and is the one appropriate to an outside observer at a fixed distance from the black hole. Using (23) with σ replaced by $\overline{\sigma}$ we get

$$t_{--}(\overline{\sigma}^-) = \lambda^2\frac{26}{24}\left[1 - \frac{1}{(1 + ae^{\lambda\overline{\sigma}^-})^2}\right]$$

in agreement at late light cone times with the rate of decay of mass.

The important point is that our analysis shows, that the rate of decay of the apparent horizon, and the flux of Hawking radiation, are governed by the ghost conformal anomaly, but is of opposite sign (and hence the right sign for positive Hawking radiation) to what one might naively expect from arguments which do not correctly take back reaction into account. The problem with those arguments can be seen from the second relation in (21) for the stress tensor. In the usual semi-classical argument only the last term (proportional to κ) is taken as radiation (caused by quantum anomalies). However when one substitutes the exact solution into the "classical part" there are terms $O(e^{2\phi})$ in the solution which when multiplied by the overall factor $e^{-2\phi}$ gives terms which are of the same order as the term which is explicitly proportional to κ. It is unclear which of these are to be considered back reaction terms and which are radiation. By contrast our assumption of no ghosts in the asymptotically Minkowski frame which covers the whole space is unambiguous.

One curious feature however is that (see (25)) the apparent horizon goes over asymptotically to the classical horizon as $\sigma^+ \to 0$. Thus a horizon remains even though there is no singularity behind it (as we argued earlier). One could also consider (primordial) black holes by taking $a = 0 = b_\pm$ in (24), but putting $a_+ + a_- = \frac{M}{\lambda}$. In this case we see from (19) that the horizon recedes all the way to end of space-time $\sigma^- = 0$. One remaining puzzle however is that the rate of Hawking radiation and the rate of decay of mass are asymptotically constant (in the $\overline{\sigma}$ frame).It is not clear why the radiation stops (as it should when the mass goes to zero). Perhaps this is related to our choice of asymptotically Minkowski coordinates which was governed by the classical solution. This probably needs to be corrected but at this point it is unclear how to do this.

Finally we note that the physics is essentially determined by the Liouville like theory (7). In particular none of our conclusions would be changed if we had used the proposal of Strominger [5] which would have slightly modified the relation between X, Y and ϕ, ρ (see [6], [7]).

Acknowledgements: I wish to thank Joe Polchinski for a discussion. This work is partially supported by Department of Energy contract No. DE-FG02-91-ER-40672.

Note added. The Bondi (or ADM) mass of our solutions can be computed directly from the expressions for the stress tensors in terms of the fields X, Y.

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\pm\pm} =& -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\pm X \partial_\pm X - \partial_\pm Y \partial_\pm Y) - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\partial_\pm^2 Y + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \partial_\pm f^i \partial_\pm f^i \\ T_{+-} =& \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\partial_+\partial_- Y - \lambda^2 e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(X-Y)}. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

To find the mass we need to linearize around a reference static solution in asymptotically Minkowski coordinates. In our original coordinate system in which $g_\pm$ are zero we may choose such a static solution to be

$$X = Y = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(\lambda^2\sigma^+\sigma^- + \frac{26}{24}\log(-\sigma^+\sigma^-)),\ f = 0.$$

.

This is obtained from equations (13) and (24) by putting $a_\pm = b_\pm = a = 0$ in (24). Transforming to the asymptotically Minkowski coordinates $\overline{\sigma}^\pm$ defined by $\sigma^+ = \frac{1}{\lambda}e^{\lambda\overline{\sigma}^+}, \sigma^- = -\frac{1}{\lambda}e^{-\lambda\overline{\sigma}^-}$,

$$\begin{aligned} X =& -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\left(e^{\lambda(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}^-)} - \frac{26}{24}\lambda(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}^-) + \frac{26}{24}\log\lambda^2\right) \\ =& Y - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\lambda(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}^-). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

This solution corresponds to the classical linear dilaton solution. Linearizing around this solution we have the following expression for the Bondi mass

$$
\begin{aligned}
M(\overline{\sigma}^-) &= -\int d\overline{\sigma}^+(\delta T_{++} + \delta T_{+-}) \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\lambda e^{(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}^-)}(\delta X - \delta Y) + \frac{26}{24}\lambda(\delta X - \delta Y) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}\lambda\delta Y + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}(\partial_+\delta Y - \partial_-\delta Y).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

It is easily seen that this expression (apart from the ghost terms), goes over to equation (26) of [1] in the semi-classical limit $\kappa e^{2\phi} << 1$.

First we can look for static solutions corresponding to black holes. In this case we must put $a = b_\pm = 0$ and $a_\pm \neq 0$. Then for $\overline{\sigma}^+ >> 1$, $\delta Y = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}(a_+ + a_-) = \delta X$ and we have from (30),

$$
M(\overline{\sigma}^-) = \lambda(a_+ + a_-)
$$

So this solution corresponds to black holes with constant mass. Now let us consider the collapsing matter solutions with $a_\pm = b_\pm = 0, a \neq 0$. In this case

$$
\delta X = \delta Y = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\left[ae^{\lambda\overline{\sigma}_0^+} - \theta(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}_0^+) - \frac{26}{24}\log\left(1 + \frac{a}{\lambda}e^{+\lambda\overline{\sigma}^-}\theta(\overline{\sigma}^+ - \overline{\sigma}_0^+)\right)\right]
$$

Substituting in (30) and taking the derivative with respect to $\overline{\sigma}^-$, we have for the rate of decay of Bondi mass,

$$
\left.\frac{dM}{d\overline{\sigma}^-}\right|_{\overline{\sigma}^- \to \infty} = -\frac{26}{24}\lambda^2
$$

in agreement with the rate of Hawking radiation calculated earlier. The expression for the the mass itself is,

$$
M(\overline{\sigma}^-) = a\lambda e^{\lambda\overline{\sigma}_-^+} - \frac{26}{24}\lambda\log(1 + \frac{a}{\lambda}e^{\lambda\overline{\sigma}^-}) - \frac{26}{24}\frac{\lambda}{1 + \frac{\lambda}{a}e^{-\lambda\overline{\sigma}^-}}.
$$

This expression resolves the puzzle that we mentioned in the discussion after equation in the penultimate paragraph of the paper. The Hawking radiation does not

stop because the Bondi mass goes all the way to negative infinity! This is not surprising since as we saw from the static solutions there are solutions with arbitrarily negative mass ($a_+ + a_-$ can be chosen to be negative). This is not an artifact of the quantization of the theory. Even the classical dilaton gravity theory has negative mass solutions and the theory has no ground state. It should be noted that there is no positive energy theorem for dilaton gravity in 2 dimensions since the dilaton kinetic energy has the wrong sign. (In higher dimensions it is possible to perform a Weyl transformation to the canonical metric in terms of which the dilaton kinetic energy has the right sign). Of course in the classical theory negative mass solutions have naked singularities whereas as we have shown the quantum corrections tame these singularities.

Even though the theory has no ground state it nevertheless illustrates explicitly several important effects that one expects a more realistic theory to satisfy, namely the taming of classical singularities by quantum effects, and the back reaction of the Hawking radiation which causes the mass of the black hole to decay.

Acknowledgement: I wish to thank Andy Strominger for an e-mail message on work done by him and Steve Giddings.

REFERENCES

1. C.G. Callan, S.B. Giddings, J.A. Harvey, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) R1005.
2. S. W. Hawking, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199.
3. J.G. Russo, L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, Stanford preprint (1992) SU-ITP-92-4, and L. Susskind and L. Thorlacius, Stanford preprint (1992) SU-ITP-92-12.
4. T. Banks, A. Dabholkar, M.R. Douglas, and M O'Loughlin, Rutgers preprint RU-91-54.
5. A. Strominger ITP Santa Barbara preprint (1992) UCSBTH-92-18, hepth@xxx/9205028.

6. S. P. de Alwis, Colorado preprint, (1992) COLO-HEP-280, hepth@xxx/9205069.

7. A. Bilal and C. Callan, Princeton preprint (1992) PUPT-1320, hepth@xxx/9205089.

8. F. David, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3** (1988) 1651, J.Distler and H. Kawai, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321** (1989) 509.

9. A. Chamseddine, *Phys. Lett.* **256B** (1991) 379, and *Phys. Lett.* **258B** (1991) 97, *Nucl. Phys.* **B368** (1992) 98; A Chamseddine and Th. Burwick, preprint hepth 9204002. S. P. de Alwis and J. Lykken, *Phys. Lett.* **269B** (1991) 264, J. Russo and A. Tseytlin, SU-ITP-2, DAMTP-1-1992.